

United States Patent and Trademark Office

her

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/659,944	09/12/2003	Daniel McCarrick	81084432	5068
22844	7590 02/24/2006		EXAMINER	
FORD GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES, LLC.			AURORA, REENA	
SUITE 600 - PARKLANE TOWERS EAST ONE PARKLANE BLVD.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DEARBOR	N, MI 48126		2862	
			DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/659,944	MCCARRICK ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Reena Aurora	2862				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE on time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ver to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 D	ecember 2005.					
2a) □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
•=	, -						
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)🖂	4) Claim(s) 1 - 37 is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>17 - 36</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	S) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠							
7)							
• —							
	on Papers	,					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is in response to amendment received on 12/21/05.

Claims 1 – 16 and 37 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Babin et al. (5,825,176).

As to claim 37, Babin et al. (hereinafter Babin) discloses an apparatus and method for sensing the rotational speed of a inner member (304) comprising the steps of generating a magnetic flux path that passes from the sensor (332) through the second component (308) and extends to the target component, rotation of the target component causing changes in a characteristic of the magnetic flux path; generating a position signal that varies in response to changes in said characteristic; and determining a rotational speed of the target component based on values of the signal over time without reference to another signal (col. 4, lines 23 – 29 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13 – 15 arerejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babin et al. (5,825,176) in view of Goossens (4,721,8641).

As to claims 13 - 15, Babin discloses an apparatus for sensing the rotational speed of a inner member comprising a target component (304, fig. 15) mounted for rotation; a sensor (332); a second component (made of low carbon steel, 308) that continuously covers a path between the sensor (332) the target component (304) and includes no source of magnetic flux and the sensor (332) including a coil (334) and a magnet generating a flux path extending through said portion of the second component to said target component, the flux path having a magnetic reluctance that varies with rotation of the target component (304), the coil (334) carrying a signal generated in response to changes in said reluctance, the signal having a amplitude and a frequency indicative of the rotational speed of the target component (col. 4, lines 23 – 29 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 17). Babin fails to show that the second component continuosly covers a path between the sensor and the target component and includes no source of magnet flux. Goosens discloses an inductive pulse generator wherein the second

component (308)continuosly covers a path between the sensor (332) and the target (304) component and includes no source of magnet flux.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Babin in view of Goosens such that keeping the target hidden from the sensor would protect the sensor from external particles and magnetic fields and therefore would increase the efficiency of the device

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babin et al. (5,825,176) in view of Goossens (4,721,8641) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Applicant's admission (AA).

As to claims 1 - 3, Babin et al. (hereinafter Babin) discloses an apparatus for sensing the rotational speed of a inner member comprising a target component (304, fig. 15) supported for rotatation; a sensor (332) facing the target (304); a second component (made of low carbon steel) (308) interposed between the sensor (332) and target component (304); and being formed of material having relative magnetic permeability equal to or less than 25.0; and a sensor (332) including a coil and a

magnet generating a flux path extending through the portion of the second component to the target component, the flux path having a reluctance that varies with rotation of the target component, the coil carrying a signal generated in response to changes in said reluctance, the signal having a frequency representing the rotational speed of the target component (col. 4, lines 23 – 29 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 17). Babin fails to explicitly disclose that the target is continually hidden form view of the sensor by the second component and the portion of the second component being formed of material having a relative magnetic permeability equal to or less than 25.0. However, AA clearly discloses that the second component has low magnetic permeability (page 2, lines 6 -9). Goosens further discloses that the second component (14) is made of non-magnetic material (col. 1, lines 59 - 61). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Babin in view of AA and further in view of the teachings of Goosens such that providing second component of non-magnetic material to hide the sensor from the target would provide more accurate measurement such that the sensor is not being exposed to the external enviornment.

As to claim16, Babin discloses an apparatus for sensing the rotational speed of a inner member comprising a second component (308) blocking the target component from a magnetic source (304); and the magnetic source (332) generating a magnetic flux path within which the target component (304) and second component (308) are located, rotation of the target component (304) causing changes in a characteristic of the magnetic flux path; a detector (332) generating a position signal that varies in

response to changes in said characteristic; and a controller for determining a rotational speed of the target component based on values of said position signal over time without reference to another signal (col. 4, lines 23 – 29 and col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 17). Babin does not explicitly disclose that the second component is continuously blocking the target and the second component being formed of material having a relative magnetic permeability equal to or less than 25.0. However, AA clearly discloses that the second component has low magnetic permeability (page 2, lines 6 - 9). Goosens further discloses that the second component (14) is made of non-magnetic material (col. 1. lines 59 - 61) and the second component (14) is continuously blocking the target componet (1) from the magnetic source (10). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Babin in view of AA and further in view of the teachings of Goosens such that providing second component of non-magnetic material to hide the sensor from the target would provide more accurate measurement such that the sensor is not being exposed to the external enviornment.

As to claims 6 and 7, Babin discloses that the target component (304) includes an outer surface facing the sensor and having a plurality of mutually spaced surface variations (308, 328) on the outer surface.

As to claim 8, Babin discloses that the magnet generating a magnetic field and the sensor further comprises a ferrite core (340, 326), and the coil (334) is wound around the core.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,944

Art Unit: 2862

As to claims 9 - 12, Babin, Goosens and AA fail to disclose that the stainless is formed by stamping. However, it is well known in the art to stamp stainless at a desired temperature to exhibit desired resiliency.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babin et al. (5,825,176) in view of Goossens (4,721,8641) and Applicant's admission (AA) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Garshelis (6,260,423).

As to claim 4, Babin and Goosens fail to disclose that the material of the second component has a concentration of martensite that is less than thirty percent. Garshelis discloses a magnetoelastic torque sensor wherein Garshelis further discloses that martensite has permeability in the range from 10 to 100 (col. 25, lines 28 - 31). Therefore, the lower the concentration of martensite the lower the permeability of the material. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Babin in view of Goosens and further in view of the teachings of Garshelis such that providing lower concentration of martensite in second component would result in decreased permeability of the second component.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Babin et al. (5,825,176) in view of Goossens (4,721,8641) and Applicant's admission (AA) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hansen (6,528,989).

As to claim 5, Babin, Goosens and AA fail to disclose that the portion is a member of the group consisting of aluminum, titanium and stainless steel. Hansan discloses a magnetic tracker wherein Hansan further discloses that aluminum, titanium

and stainless steel (col. 25, lines 28 - 31). Therefore, the lower the concentration of martensite the lower the permeability of the material. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Babin in view of Goosens and Applicant's admission and further in view of the teachings of Hansan such that providing the portion is a member of the group consisting of aluminum, titanium and stainless steel having low permeability would result in overall decreased permeability of the second component.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 16 and 37 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reena Aurora whose telephone number is 571-272-2263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, E. Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/659,944

Art Unit: 2862

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 9